REMARKS

Claims 8-14 and 20-21 are now pending in this application, claims 15-19 having been canceled above. Claims 8, 20 and 21 are the independent claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C §102(e)

Claims 8-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nurmann et al. (US Patent No. 6,560,642, "Nurmann").

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C §103(a)

Claims 9, 17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nurmann in view of Kim (US Patent Pub. No. 2003/0214955, "Kim").

The above rejections are hereby traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 8, 20 and 21 all require a determination as to whether an Internet Protocol (IP) address is a private Internet Protocol address.

In rejecting independent claims 8, 20 and 21 the Examiner states on page of the final Office Action that

> Nurmann discloses that an IP address of an IP host is examined to determine if specific criterion are met before configuration procedures are established (see column 3, lines 30-34). Furthermore, Nurmann discloses that the IP addresses are prepared for allocation and configuration (see column 4, line 51-column 5, line 5). The Examiner believes this preparation for allocation and configuration requires examination of the IP address.

Even assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's assertions cited above are correct, Applicant respectfully submits that Nurmann nevertheless fails to determine whether an Internet Protocol Address is a private Internet Protocol address, as required by independent claims 8, 20 and 21. In particular, while Nurmann may need to examine the IP address in order to prepare them for allocation and configuration, nothing in Nurmann suggests that IP addresses must be examined in order to determine if they are private IP addresses. Indeed, as Nurmann states at column 2, lines 37-42, "The Invention therefore has the basic problem of creating a method of establishing an IP network with several IP hosts and with an IP gateway *which method requires*

6

no knowledge of the address mechanisms of the Internet protocol [emphasis added]..." That is, one of the stated goals of Nurmann is to avoid doing precisely the type of examination that is performed by the invention set forth in claims 8, 20 and 21, which does require knowledge of Internet Protocol address mechanisms so that private IP addresses can be determined. Accordingly, Nurmann does not show or suggest the claimed feature of requiring a determination as to whether an Internet Protocol (IP) address is a private Internet Protocol address. Moreover, the remaining references cited by the Examiner do not overcome this deficiency of Nurmann.

Accordingly, for at least this reason Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 8, 20 and 21 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes there are still unresolved issues, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcomed.

FEES

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be due and owing as a result of this Amendment to the undersigned attorney's PTO Deposit Account #50-1047.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stuart H. Mayer/

Please continue to send all correspondence to:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1303 East Algonquin Road
3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Stuart H. Mayer
Registration No. 35,277

(908) 518-7700